

Organization UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Bldg./Room \_\_\_\_\_  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450  
If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Official Business  
Penalty For Private Use, \$300

U.S. OFFICIAL MAIL  
PENALTY FOR  
PRIVATE USE \$300  
AMERICAN POSTAGE  
PAID  
BY  
MAY  
2006  
PITNEY BOWES  
\$ 00.390  
02 1A  
0004205065 JAN 18 2006  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

**RECEIVED**  
JAN 27 2006  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

Pennie & Edmonds, LLP  
1667 K Street NW  
Washington DC 20006

**RECEIVED**

JAN 25 2006

USPTO MAIL CENTER

006

RETURN TO SENDER  
ATTEMPTED - NOT KNOWN  
UNABLE TO FORWARD

BC : 22313

NIXXIE

206

1

08 01/20/06

\*0117-00635-10-41



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*JK FW*  
petitions office

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)  
DWW Jan-06

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004

**RECEIVED**

JAN 27 2006

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**



In re Application of :  
Heyse et al. :  
Application No. 09/182,499 :  
Filed: 30 October, 1996 :  
Atty Docket No. 060942-0268-US :

**COPY MAILED**

JAN 17 2006

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petitions filed on 9 September, 2003, under 37 CFR 1.181 to withdraw the holding of abandonment and under 37 CFR 1.137(b),<sup>1</sup> to revive the above-identified application.

The Office apologizes for the delay in responding to the present petition and regrets any inconvenience to petitioners.

<sup>1</sup> Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application, abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c).

The petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment is **DISMISSED**.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned on 17 December, 2000, for failure to timely reply to the Office Communication mailed on 16 November, 2000, which set a one (1) month shortened period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 15 August, 2001.

Petitioners request withdraw of the holding of abandonment in that the response filed on 19 July, 2000, was a proper reply.

Petitioner concededly received the Office communication mailed on 16 November, 2000, but failed to provide the necessary and timely reply. The failure to supply the proper reply was the fault of petitioner, not the USPTO. As noted in *Brenner v. Ebbert*:<sup>2</sup>

The Constitution requires notice reasonably designed to forewarn against approaching default; but it does not insure against the effects of a mistaken response to timely notice knowingly received.

It follows that petition had received the reasonable notice required so as to ensure a timely and full response to the Notices. That petitioner failed to timely and adequately respond was unfortunate, but such failure did not operate to save this application from abandonment.

As such, the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment is **dismissed**.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) is **granted**.

The address provided in the petition is different than the correspondence address of record. A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to the address in the petition. All future correspondence will be mailed solely to the address of record.

The application will be referred to Technology Center Art Unit 2854 for further processing.

---

<sup>2</sup> 398 F.2d 762, 765, 157 USPQ 609, 611 (D.C. Cir. 1968), cert. den. 159 USPQ 799.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned at 571-272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

cc: Pennie & Edmonds LLP  
1667 K Street NW  
Washington DC 20006